

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT
(Tehama)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

RAMON SISNEROS CONNOLLY,

Defendant and Appellant.

C087331

(Super. Ct. No. 16CR001055)

Appointed counsel for defendant Ramon Sisneros Connolly has filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and asks this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Finding no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant, we will affirm the judgment.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

We provide the following brief description of the facts and procedural history of the case. (See *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 110, 123-124.)

In December 2016, defendant was charged with resisting a police officer (Pen. Code, § 69) and unlawful possession of methamphetamine (Health & Saf. Code, § 11377, subd. (a)). Later that month, defendant pleaded no contest to resisting a police officer. In January 2017, the trial court imposed but suspended execution of a three-year state prison

sentence and granted defendant probation for five years, with the condition that he participate in and complete a residential drug and alcohol counseling program.

In March 2018, the probation department alleged defendant had violated probation due to being discharged from a residential treatment program. In April 2018, the trial court held a hearing and found the allegation true. In May 2018, the trial court denied reinstatement of probation and ordered the three-year state prison sentence be executed.

Defendant timely appealed and did not obtain a certificate of probable cause.

DISCUSSION

Appointed counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and asks us to determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Counsel advised defendant of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. More than 30 days have elapsed, and we have received no such communication from defendant.

We have undertaken an examination of the entire record and find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

_____/s/
HOCH, J.

We concur:

_____/s/
ROBIE, Acting P. J.

_____/s/
MURRAY, J.